



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,756	04/21/2004	William R. Kissel	71,033-014	5337
27305	7590	09/07/2005	EXAMINER	
HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C. THE PINEHURST OFFICE CENTER, SUITE #101 39400 WOODWARD AVENUE BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-5151			NGUYEN, TAN QUANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3661	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



*He*



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20050902

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

*Tan Q Nguyen*  
TAN Q NGUYEN  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 3661

## **DETAIL ACTION**

### ***Notice to Applicant(s)***

1. This office action is response to the Responsive to the Restriction filed on June 06, 2005. The applicant elected Group I which includes 1-38 with traverse. However, the argument is persuasive and thus the previous restriction has been withdrawn. Claims 1-40 are still pending.
2. Claims 4 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 4 should depend on claim 3 instead of 2. In the rejections below, examiner assumed that claim 4 depends on claim 3.
3. In claim 22, line 2, the extra letter "a" should be deleted.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Croyle et al. (6,308,134).

Art Unit: 3661

6. As per claim 1 and 20, Croyle et al. disclose a method and system for establishing an acceleration of a vehicle which includes an acceleration device for measuring accelerations of the vehicle in a first direction (longitudinal) and a second direction (lateral), wherein the first and second directions being perpendicular (see at least column 1, line 50 to column 2, line 6). Croyle et al. further disclose a controller coupled to the acceleration device for establishing a magnitude of a horizontal component of the acceleration of the vehicle as a function of a gravity vector and the first and second acceleration values (see at least column 5, lines 14-29).

7. As per claims 2 and 22, Croyle et al. disclose that the component acceleration in the lateral direction and longitudinal direction, which is inherently defined a horizontal plane.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the background of the invention on page 2, paragraph 0008 (the "admitted art") in view of Croyle et al. as applied to the claims above.

10. The "admitted art" disclose a system and method for controlling the braking of the towing vehicle which uses an accelerometer mounted directly to a printed circuit board within the cab of the towing vehicle (see paragraph 0008). The "admitted art" does not disclose the use of horizontal component of the acceleration as a function of a gravity vector, a first and a second acceleration values. However, such establishing a magnitude of the horizontal of the acceleration of the towing vehicle is Taught in Croyle et al. as discussed above. It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Croyle et al. into the "admitted art" in order to improve the braking system of the towing vehicle by solving the restriction of the prescribed range of angular positions by using the magnitude of the acceleration in the horizontal plane.

11. Claims 3-19 and 22-38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. Although the prior art disclose several claimed limitations, none of the references teaches the system and method which includes the steps of applying a first offset value in the establishing the first acceleration value, and applying a second offset value in the establishing the second acceleration values, wherein the step of establishing the first and second offset values using a calibration routine which recited in claims 3-5 and 22-24. Further, the limitations recited in claims 6-19 and 25-39 render the claims unobvious over the prior arts of record.

### ***Conclusion***

13. Claims 1, 2, 20, 21, 38 and 40 are rejected. Claims 3-19 and 22-38 are objected.

Art Unit: 3661

14. The following references are cited as being of general interest: Schiffmann et al. (6,002,975), Pickhard et al. (6,205,401), Horton et al. (6,421,622), Greaves, Jr. (6,874,602), Smith (2002/0092188).

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Tan Q. Nguyen, whose telephone number is (571) 272-6966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 5:30 AM-4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black, can be reached on (571) 272-6956.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to the Official Fax Center:

(571) 273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/tqn  
September 6, 2005

  
**TAN Q. NGUYEN**  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3661